

Senate Budget and Fiscal Review
SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1

EDUCATION
Jack Scott, Chair
John Vasconcellos
Bob Margett

PART I

**May 12, 2003
1:30 p.m.
Room 113**

Page

I. California Department of Education (6110)

- | | | |
|-----------|--|----|
| A. | Proposition 98 Update | |
| B. | Selected State Education Programs: | |
| | 1. AVID | 2 |
| | 2. ROC/P | 3 |
| C. | LEA Reserve Flexibility | 4 |
| D. | Federal Funds -- Selected NCLB Programs | 6 |
| | 1. Title I --Reading First | 6 |
| | 2. Title I -- State Set-Aside for School Improvement | 7 |
| | 3. Title VI -- State Assessments | 7 |
| E. | Education Data Systems | 8 |
| | 1. Longitudinal Data- Base | 8 |
| | 2. Ed-Data Website | 9 |
| F. | April Finance Letters | 10 |

II. California School Finance Authority (0985)

- | | | |
|-----------|--|----|
| A. | Charter Schools Facilities Program (April Finance Letter) | 12 |
|-----------|--|----|

III. Consent -- Vote Only **14**

I. California Department of Education

A. Proposition 98 Update

- *Presentation by LAO: Status of Proposition 98 – Current and Budget Years*

B. Selected State Education Programs

1. AVID (Advanced Via Individual Determination) –6110-130-0001

Background: The AVID program is a college preparatory program that works with middle and high school students, particularly students from disadvantaged families in which no member has ever attended college. The program is designed to increase learning and performance so that students are eligible and prepared for college. Students enrolled in the program attend an elective class taught by a specially trained teacher.

The AVID program currently serves approximately 71,000 students in 1,007 middle and high schools in California. The AVID program has demonstrated success in preparing students for college. An independent evaluation of the program indicates that 95 percent of AVID students go on to college – 77 percent to a four-year college and 17 percent to a community college.

Budget Action/Issues: The Governor's Budget proposes to reduce funding for the AVID program by 50 percent in the budget year. The Governor's Budget provides \$5.15 million in General Funds (Non-Proposition 98) for the AVID program in 2003-04 – half of the \$10.3 million available for AVID in 2002-03.

Of the \$5.15 million proposed for AVID in the Governor's Budget, \$1 million is available for AVID regional centers; \$2.75 million for competitive grants to LEA's; and \$1.4 million for advanced placement teacher training or tutoring services.

The 50 percent reduction of this K-12 program is similar to the level of reductions proposed by the Governor for college outreach programs. In contrast, the Governor proposes across-the-board reductions for most K-12 categorical programs of approximately 12 percent. AVID is not included in the Governor's K-12 Education Block grant proposal.

2. ROC/P (Regional Occupational Centers and Programs)

Background: California's 73 Regional Occupational Centers and Programs (ROCPs) provide high school students 16 years of age and older, and also adult students, with valuable career and technical education so students can (1) enter the workforce with skills and competencies to be successful; (2) pursue advanced training in higher educational institutions; or (3) upgrade existing skills and knowledge.

Approximately 460,000 students are currently enrolled in Regional Occupational Centers and Programs. Students receive training at a variety of venues from regular classrooms to actual business and industry facilities such as automotive dealerships and hospitals. In most ROCPs, courses are offered during the regular school day throughout the school year, in the late afternoon and evening, and sometimes during the summer months.

ROCPs generally follow three distinct organizational structures:

(1) school districts participating in a county office of education operated ROCP; (2) school districts participating under a joint powers agreement; or (3) a single school district. ROCPs in California collaborate with public agencies and associations to create and implement important instructional classes and programs.

ROCPs work in partnership with local business and industry to design and provide programs for industry-based, transferable and portable certification programs based upon job market demand. The program is funded through the principal apportionment system, based upon the level of student ADA for programs.

Budget Action/Issues: The Governor's Budget proposes a \$12 million reduction in General Funds (Proposition 98) for the ROC/P program by limiting program enrollment to students under the age of 16, unless the student is in 11th grade or higher or participates in a special education program. The Administration estimates that this change in statute would reduce the eligible student population for ROC/P by 3 percent and generate \$12 million in savings in the budget year.

The Administration makes this proposal because it is "concerned that some districts may be encouraging younger students to enter ROC/P's as a means of receiving concurrent enrollment, rather than to serve the best interests of that student."

The Administration also asserts that alternative education and career-technical education programs are available to younger high school students through another program -- Partnership Academies.

Overall, the Governor's Budget estimates funding of \$342.3 million for ROC/P programs in 2003-04, a \$30.9 million reduction (8.3 percent) from 2002-03. The Governor proposes to include ROC/P funding and programs as a part of the K-12 Education Block Grant proposal.

C. LEA Reserve Flexibility

The Subcommittee will hear testimony from a number of individuals and organizations who will discuss the benefits and risks of providing greater flexibility to LEA's by:

(1) lowering the level of budget reserves for economic uncertainties, and/or

(2) giving LEA's greater access to funding from restricted reserve accounts.

Background: Existing law requires the State Board of Education to adopt standards and criteria to be used by local educational agencies in the development of annual budgets and the management of subsequent expenditures from that budget. Existing law requires those standards and criteria to include comparisons and reviews of reserves and fund balances.

Current State Board of Education standards and criteria require local educational agencies to maintain reserves for economic uncertainties. The amount of that reserve varies by districts, from 1 to 4 percent, based on a sliding scale by size. Most districts are required to maintain a 3 percent reserve. The funding to which the percentage is applied is based on both general and categorical funding received, but the reserve itself must be maintained with resources from districts' general funds.

The Governor proposed eliminating the general fund reserve requirement entirely for the 2002-03 fiscal year. Instead, the Legislature approved a provision in SB 18X that provides limited flexibility to LEA's in accessing their reserves for economic uncertainty and restricted reserve accounts in the current year.

Specifically, SB 18X, authorizes a local educational agency to use, for purposes determined by its governing body, up to 50% of its reserves for economic uncertainties and up to 50% of the balances, as of July 1, 2002, of restricted accounts in its General Fund, excluding restricted reserves committed for capital outlay, bond funds, sinking funds, and federal funds.

SB 18X also states the intent of the Legislature that local educational agencies use this flexibility for certain purposes and make every effort to maintain a prudent expenditure plan that ensures solvency for the 2002–03 fiscal year and in subsequent fiscal years.

As enacted, provision 3 of SB 18X includes the following language:

33128.2. (a) Notwithstanding the standards and criteria adopted pursuant to paragraph (3) of subdivision (a) of Section 33128 or any other law, for the 2002–03 fiscal year only, a local educational agency may use for purposes determined by its governing body up to 50 percent of its reserves for economic uncertainties and up to 50 percent of the balances, as of July 1, 2002, of restricted accounts in its General Fund, excluding restricted reserves committed for capital outlay, bond funds, sinking funds, and federal funds, in order to provide local budgeting flexibility as a result of midyear budget reductions for the 2002–03 fiscal year that are enacted by the Legislature after January 2003. (b) A local educational agency may not, pursuant to paragraph (a), use the combined budgetary reserves in excess of its total midyear budget reductions for the 2002–03 fiscal year. (c) It is the intent of the Legislature that a local educational agency use the flexibility provided in subdivision (a) to the extent midyear budget reductions for the 2002–03 fiscal year occur in the following programs:

(1) The Peer Assistance and Review Program.

(2) Supplemental instruction and remedial programs.

(3) One-time funding for the Instructional Materials Funding Realignment Program.

(d) It is further the intent of the Legislature that a local educational agency make every effort to maintain a prudent expenditure plan that ensures its solvency for the 2002–03 fiscal year and in subsequent fiscal years.

Budget Action/Issues: There is no specific proposal before the Subcommittee from either the Governor or the Legislative Analyst's office. Several education organizations have requested that LEA's be given additional flexibility in accessing local fund reserves in order to maintain classroom instruction given the fiscal enormous budget shortfalls facing our schools.

Suggested Questions:

- *In providing reserve flexibility to LEA's should it be time limited? Assuming the state's fiscal health is restored in the future, does it make sense to provide flexibility permanently?*
- *How have the provisions of SB 18X been utilized by LEA's?*
- *CDE has reportedly had difficulty clarifying the meaning of the reserve flexibility provisions of SB 18X for LEAs. What are the specific problems and are there lessons learned that could inform the Legislature's thinking on any proposals in the budget year?*
- *Do state agencies or LEA's have any idea about the amount of funding currently contained in restricted reserve accounts? Do such funds accumulate from particular categorical programs? Are there differences in how LEA's spend and accumulate funds from these accounts?*
- *In providing flexibility to LEA's are there some restricted reserves that should not be tapped, for example funds for Economic Impact Aid?*

D. Federal Funds – Selected NCLB Programs

Background: In January 2002, President Bush signed legislation re-authorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The newly signed law –No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001– makes sweeping changes to the previous Title I program under the ESEA law.

NCLB authorizes approximately \$21.8 billion in federal fiscal year (FFY) 2003 for federal elementary and secondary education programs targeted to economically disadvantaged students. Of this amount, California is slated to receive \$2.9 billion in funds to implement NCLB in 2003-04. This represents an increase of \$304.5 million for programs authorized under No Child Left Behind -- including Title I programs -- in 2003-04.

The Subcommittee will consider the following budget items appropriating federal funds for programs authorized under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2002 (NCLB). At its April 21st hearing, the Subcommittee requested the CDE, LAO and DOF to develop expenditure plans for two of the following three programs. The Subcommittee requested that these plans address both budget year appropriations and any carryover funds from the current year that could be built into the budget year.

1. Title I –Reading First (6110-126-0890)

Background: This is a new program to assist states and local education agencies in establishing scientific research-based reading programs for all children in Kindergarten through grade three. The program is intended to ensure that every student can read at or above grade level before the end of third grade. It replaces the Reading Excellence Program, a competitive grant program to states.

Funding for the program is distributed pursuant to Chapter 730, Statutes of 2002 (AB 64/Strom-Martin), which provides competitive grants to K-3 classes in approved Reading First schools.

The State Board of Education previously determined that bilingual education programs are not eligible for Reading First grants, since they require 1 to 2.5 hours of English language arts instruction in English each day. Significant controversy has arisen because these programs are being left out of Reading First. As a result, bilingual education program advocates filed a lawsuit in State Superior Court challenging this decision.

The Superior Court ordered an injunction allowing bilingual programs to be eligible for Reading First program at present. However, last month the State Board approved emergency regulations to implement the Reading First Program and began the process for adopting permanent regulations. Schools are deemed eligible if they implement a full English-language arts program using the adopted instructional materials in English one hour a day in Kindergarten and 2.5 hours a day in grades 1-3.

Budget Action/Issues: California is receiving \$133 million in funding for Reading First in 2002-03. In 2003-04, California is slated to receive an additional \$13.6 million for Reading First, bringing total funding to \$146.6 million.

Staff Question: What options does CDE have for making Title I Reading First funds available to bilingual education programs?

2. Title I – Part A Set-Aside Funds for School Improvement (6110-136-0890)

Background: Federal law requires that states set-aside two percent of their Title I, Part A funds for school improvement purposes. These funds are to be used to assist schools, i.e. provide interventions and sanctions, identified as program improvement schools. The two percent set-aside requirement grows to four percent in 2004-05.

Budget Action/Issues: The 2002-03 budget provides approximately \$29.1 million in Title I set-aside funds for school intervention programs. It is estimated that approximately \$31.4 million will be available for this purpose in 2003 –04. In addition, CDE estimates that there will be \$15.1 million in savings from Title I set-aside funds in savings from the current year.

As proposed, these funds are provided for school intervention programs pursuant to Chapter 1020, Statutes of 2002 (AB 312/Strom-Martin).

Staff Comments: Does DOF and CDE have a plan for spending Title I set-aside funds in the current and budget years?

3. Title VI – State Assessments (6110-113-0890)

Background: The Title VI program provide states with funds to help cover the costs of meeting the assessment and data requirements of NCLB, including developing or improving assessments, developing curriculum and performance standards, expanding testing accommodations for English learners and students with disabilities, developing student data systems to track achievement and other indicators – such as graduation rates – required by NCLB, and increasing local capacity for improving student achievement.

Budget Action/Issues: The Governor's Budget provides \$27.6 million in 2003-04, but has not specified how all of these federal funds will be prioritized and spent. In addition, the Governor's Budget does not contemplate how additional funds from the current year might be spent.

The LAO recommends that any additional Title VI funds be spent on:

- (1) expansion and enhancement of the longitudinal student-level database,
- (2) the establishment of a teacher-level data base,
- (3) new primary language tests, and/or
- (4) new cohorts of the California School Information System (CSIS).

Staff Comments: Does DOF and CDE have a plan for spending Title VI State Assessment funds in the current and budget years?

E. Education Data Systems

1. Longitudinal Data System

Background: Under NCLB, states must maintain a comprehensive data system as a part of their accountability systems. NCLB requires a range of performance indicators and will require a wide range of data to be collected at the student, school and state levels.

While some of this data is currently available, new data systems will have to be developed and existing systems modified to capture all the data and meet the new reporting requirements. Also, while California collects data about students, it does not collect student-level data that allows the state to track student level outcomes, such as graduation rates required by NCLB.

Senate Bill 1453 (Alpert), enacted in 2002, requires the CDE to contract with an entity to develop, host and maintain a longitudinal pupil achievement data system for the STAR, California English Language Development Test (CELDT), and the High School Exit Examination (HSEE).

The Department of Finance (DOF) notified the Legislature via a letter dated February 21, 2003, that they have partially approved an expenditure plan for the longitudinal data system required by SB 1453. The expenditure plan was submitted to DOF by the California Department of Education and the California Information Services (CSIS). Of the \$6.9 million in federal Title VI funds appropriated in the 2002-03 budget pursuant to

SB 1453, the DOF has approved \$460,000 in the current year (to-date). DOF anticipates approving another \$1.1 million in 2003-04.

As a result, the DOF submitted an April 1st Finance letter requesting carryover of \$6 million in Title VI funds from the current to budget year. (See Section F)

The LAO is concerned that the DOF is delaying the development of the longitudinal data system, which is needed to satisfy NCLB requirements under our state's agreements and plans with the US Department of Education. As a result, California may not be able to achieve compliance with NCLB. In particular, the LAO questions whether California will be able to provide student graduation data and other student outcome data, especially for English learners and migrant students, as required by NCLB.

Budget Issues/Questions:

- *How is California going to meet the data requirements of NCLB without a data reporting system that provides student level data? For example, how will California meet the graduation rates required by NCLB?*
- *How would you view our state's progress in implementing student level data in the short-term and long-term?*
- *What can the Department of Finance do to expedite the approval of the SB 1453 funds for development of the longitudinal data system without compromising proper review?*

Budget Action:

Staff recommends approving the April Finance letter (See Section F) that allows \$6 million in unapproved and unexpended Federal Title VI funds in the current year to carryover to the budget year for purposes of developing the Longitudinal Data System pursuant to SB 1453.

2. Ed-Data Website

Background: The Ed-Data website provides financial, demographic, and academic information for K-12 public schools. The website is operated by four partners: EdSource, the Alameda County Office of Education, the California Department of Education, and FCMAT.

Budget Action/Issues: The Governor's Budget proposes to eliminate \$418,000 in 2003-04 for the Ed-Data Website. These funds are needed to update and maintain the website.

F. April Finance Letters – Recommended Changes

On April 1, 2003, the Department of Finance requested amendments to the Governor's 2003-04 Budget for the following K-12 education items. Several of the amendments recommended by DOF are included on the consent list (See Section III)

The following three items have been set-aside for special consideration by the Subcommittee because they contain provisional language that subjects funding to approval of DOF:

1. 6110-001-0001, 6110-001-0890, and 6110-161-0890 Special Education (Issue 002, 001)

It is requested that \$250,000 be transferred from Item 6110-001-0890 to Item 6110-161-0890 for interpreter training and certification. This transfer would correctly characterize this activity as local assistance rather than state operations. As a conforming action, it is requested that Provision 18 of Item 6100-001-0890 be deleted and that provisional language be added to Item 6110-161-0890 as follows:

X. Of the funds appropriated in Schedule (1) of this item, \$250,000 shall be provided to districts for interpreter instruction, training, and certification. This funding shall be annually renewable for two years, pursuant to Department of Finance approval of an annual progress report which shall be completed by April 30 of each year, beginning in 2003.

2. 6110-112-0890, Public Charter Schools (Issue 004)

It is requested that this item be increased by \$8,369,000 to reflect the receipt of greater than anticipated federal funding for grants to charter schools. It is also requested that the Department of Finance be granted authority to shift an amount of up to \$422,00 to the SDE for state operations purposes relating to charter school grant activities upon approval of a work and expenditure plan.

It is requested that the following provisional language be added to the item:

Provisions:

X. Of the funds appropriated in this Item, an amount of up to \$422,000 may be transferred to Item 6110-001-0890 to be used for state operations purposes relating to

federal charter school grants upon Department of Finance approval of a work and expenditure plan proposed by the Department of Education.

3. 6110-113-0890, Title VI Flexibility and Accountability (Issue 100)

It is requested that Schedule (5) of Item 6110-0-113-0890 be increased by \$6,000,000 to reflect carryover from the Budget Act of 2002 that is available for a longitudinal database and data collection costs to comply with the requirements of the federal No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). The SDE requested this carryover because a feasibility study for the longitudinal database will not be completed in time to begin a project in 2002-03 and the issuance of student identifiers using these funds will not begin until 2003-04. Additionally, NCLB data requirements are being established this spring and summer through a series of state plan filings, so it is unlikely that any significant new costs to collect data in 2002-03 will be incurred.

It is requested that Provision 5 of this item be amended as follows:

"5. Funds appropriated in Schedule (5) are provided for the establishment of a longitudinal database, and for data collection requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (P.L. 107-110), pursuant to Chapter 1002, Statutes of 2002. Expenditure of these funds is subject to approval by the Department of Finance of an expenditure plan. Of these funds, \$6,000,000 in carryover funding is provided on a one-time basis. The Department of Finance may transfer funds provided pursuant to this provision to Item 6110-001-0890 to provide the State Department of Education necessary resources to meet the data collection requirements of P.L. 107-110."

Staff comments: The LAO does not support language for the above items that subjects funding to approval of the Department of Finance. In particular, the LAO has been critical of delays by DOF in approving Title VI funding for creation of the longitudinal database pursuant to Chapter 1002, Statutes of 2002 (SB 1453/Alpert). Therefore, LAO does not support language that requires DOF to continually approve an expenditure plan.

Staff notes that DOF approval may interfere with Legislative intent and may also delay funding to programs unnecessarily. Therefore, staff recommends approval of the items above with changes to delete references to approval by DOF.

II. California School Finance Authority (0985)

A. Charter Schools Facilities Program (April Finance Letter)

Chapter 935, Statutes of 2002 (AB 14) established the Charter School Facilities Program (CSFP). This pilot program is designed to meet the facilities needs of charter schools throughout the state by providing a mechanism for the distribution of \$100 million in General Obligation bond funding pursuant to Section 100620 of Chapter 33, Statutes of 2002 (AB 16).

The California School Finance Authority (CSFA), within the State Treasurer's Office, administers the CSFP. The CSFA is allowed to charge the Charter Schools Facilities Account for its administrative costs.

The State Treasurer's Office submitted an April Finance Letter request for \$531,000 in General Obligation bond funds and three permanent positions for workload associated with the CSFP. Of the amount requested, \$263,000 is for salaries and benefits, \$220,000 is for internal and external contract services, and \$48,000 is provided for operating expenses and equipment.

Staff Notes: While staff agrees that some level of resources and staffing may be required for the new program, we note the following concerns with the proposal contained in the Finance Letter:

- 1. AB 14 specifically stated the intent of the Legislature that this program be implemented as a pilot program to determine the optimum method for providing school facilities funding for charter schools. Given this intent, the establishment of permanent positions as proposed appears neither advisable nor necessary. Staff recommends instead that these positions be provided on a three-year limited-term basis. (This is consistent with the OPSC staff proposed pursuant to Prop 47.).*
- 2. The budget bill language proposed for this program would allow the Department of Finance to augment the budget of the CSFA in excess of the amount approved by the Legislature, 30 days after notification in writing is provided to the Chair of the Joint Legislative Budget Committee. However, neither of the other two departments currently administering the School Facilities Program (the State Department of Education and the Office of Public School Construction) have such latitude with state bond funds. The \$100 million provided for charter schools pursuant to AB 16 is reportedly oversubscribed by \$82 million. Since this language could result in*

additional state operations costs at the expense of local projects, it is recommended that Provision 1 of the proposed budget bill language be eliminated. (See attached alternate language.)

3. *Finally, the Finance Letter would provide funding for \$95,000 in interdepartmental contracts, \$65,000 of which is unspecified. Given that we have not been provided with adequate justification for this expenditure, and given the limited size of the bond funds available for this program, it is recommended that the funding for interdepartmental contracts be reduced by \$65,000.*

Staff recommends the following alternative language:

0985-001-6040—For the support of the California School Finance Authority, payable from the Charter School Facilities Account, 2002 State School Facilities Fund..... 531,000

Schedule: 466,000

(1) 20- Charter School Facilities Program.....531,000

Provisions: 466,000

1. ~~Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Director of Finance May authorize expenditures for the California School Finance Authority in excess of the amount appropriated not sooner than 30 days after notification in writing of the necessity therefore is provided to the chairperson of the fiscal committees and the Chairperson of the Joint Legislative Budget Committee, or not Sooner than whatever lesser time the chairperson of the Committee, or his or her designee, may in each instance Determine.~~

2.1. Of the amount appropriated in this item, \$125,000 is for the one-time support of external contracts for consultants who are qualified to provide technical assistance and training in the development of financing programs for charter schools.

III. Proposed Consent –K-12 Education

Staff recommends that the following items be Approved as Budgeted. No issues have been raised with regard to any of these Items:

April 1, 2003 Finance Letters – Consent Items

1. 6110-001-0001, Restoration of K-3 Class Reduction Position (Issue 100)

It is requested that one Education Consultant position for the School Facilities Planning Division that was proposed for elimination in the 2003-04 Governor's Budget be restored. This action reflects an inadvertent elimination of a position associated with a departmental reduction proposal. Instead, the reduction was intended to be taken from operating expenses and equipment.

2. 6110-001-0001, Elimination of One-Time Funds (Issue 450)

It is requested that this item be reduced by \$275,000 to eliminate one-time funds provided in the current fiscal year from the 2003-04 budget. Specifically, this proposal eliminates \$150,000 for developing model curriculum for human rights and genocide, and \$125,000 for studying public schools' compliance with federal Title IX.

3. 6110-006-0001, State Special Schools

It is requested that this item be augmented by \$63,000 for the purpose of correcting the employee compensation adjustment for the State Special Schools, based on revised information provided by the State Department of Education (SDE).

4. 6110-113-0890, Title VI Flexibility and Accountability (Issue 101)

It is requested that Schedule (10) of Item 6110-113-0890 be increased by \$1,500,000 to reflect carryover from the Budget Act of 2002 that is available for NCLB data collection. The SDE requested this carryover because the data collection plan has not been completed. Federal data reporting requirements for California are still under development in many areas.

5. 6110-181-0140, Environmental Education (Issues 001 and 002).

It is requested that \$188,000 in reimbursement authority be scheduled in Item 6110-181-0140 for environmental education. The Department of Water Resources (\$11,000),

California Coastal Commission (\$10,000), State and Consumer Services Agency (Energy Conservation Education) (\$156,000), and California Integrated Waste Management Board (\$11,000) will provide funding for the services. The SDE will use the funds for local grants supporting regional coordinators who facilitate instruction to K-12 pupils statewide. The SDE requests a base increase of this amount, as state agencies are expected to request this level of services on an ongoing basis. A similar increase has been provided administratively in 2002-03 pursuant to the authority of Section 28.50, Budget Act of 2002.

It is requested that provisional language be added to Item 6110-181-0140 to allow SDE to use up to \$40,000 of California Environmental License Plate Funds appropriated pursuant to environmental education grants, as authorized by Section 21190 (c) of the Public Resources Code.

It is requested that Budget Bill language be added to Item 6110-181-0140 be amended as follows to conform to these actions.

"6110-181-0140 – For local assistance, Department of Education, ~~Program 20.10.055—Environmental Education~~, payable from the California License Plate Fund400,000

(1) Program 20.10.055-Environmental Education588,000
(2) Reimbursements. –188,000

Provisions:

X. Of the amount appropriated in Schedule (1) of this item, up to \$40,000 of this appropriation may be transferred to Item 6110-001-0001 to be used for administrative costs related to the Environmental Education program, as authorized per Section 21190, Part C of the Public Resources Code."

April 21, 2003 Hearing – Consent Items -- Special Funds.

1. 6110-001-0178, Support, Schoolbus Driver Instructor Training, payable from the Driver Training Penalty Assessment Fund, \$1,035,000.
2. 6110-001-0231, Support, Curriculum Services—Health and Physical Education Drug Free Schools, payable from the Health Education Account, Cigarette and Tobacco Products Surtax Fund, \$1,003,000.
3. 6110-001-0687, Support, California State Agency for Donated Food Distribution, payable from the Donated Food Revolving Fund, \$5,254,000.

4. 6110-001-0975, Support, Library and Learning Services, payable from the California Public School Library Protection Fund, \$15,000.
5. 6110-001-6036, Support, Administrative Services to local educational agencies, payable from the 2002 State Schools Facilities Fund, \$2,188,000.
6. 6110-006-0814, Support, State Special Schools, payable from the California State Lottery Education Fund, \$133,000.
7. 6110-101-0231, Local Assistance, Curriculum Services—Health and Physical Education Drug Free Schools, payable from the Health Education Account, Cigarette and Tobacco Products Surtax Fund, \$3,793,000.
8. 6110-101-0814, Local Assistance, School Apportionment, payable from the California State Lottery Education Fund, \$799,421,000.
9. 6110-101-0975, Local Assistance, Library and Learning Resources, payable California Public School Library Protection Fund, \$345,000.
10. 6110-102-0231, Local Assistance, Curriculum Services—Health and Physical Education Drug Free Schools, payable from the Health Education Account, Cigarette and Tobacco Products Surtax Fund, \$23,200,000.
11. 6110-301-0660, Capital Outlay, payable from the Public Buildings Construction Fund, \$5,600,000. California School for the Deaf in Riverside – Preliminary working plans, working drawings, construction and equipment.